



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/895,025	07/02/2001	Toshiaki Shinohara	210096US2	7453

22850 7590 06/06/2003

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
1940 DUKE STREET  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

VU, QUANG D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	2811

DATE MAILED: 06/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/895,025	SHINOHARA, TOSHIAKI
<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
Quang D Vu	2811	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on amendment filed on 04/02/03.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 6-10 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 5 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification never discloses either the metal block or the ceramic substrate not corresponding to at least one of the plurality of semiconductor elements extends entirely over the insulation unit as claimed in claim 3. The specification discloses either the metal block or the ceramic substrate are corresponding to at least one of the plurality of semiconductor elements as shown in figures 7 and 8.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2811

4. Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,291,065 to Arai et al.

Regarding claim 1, Arai et al. (figure 10) teach a semiconductor device comprising:  
a semiconductor element (5);

a metal block (330) having a first surface and a second surface opposite to the first surface;

an aluminum wire (5g) having an electrode terminal joined to the first surface of the metal block (330); and

a ceramic substrate (301) joined to the second surface of the metal block (330) and having metal layers (312, 340) formed on both surfaces,

It is inherent that the semiconductor element (5) having an electrode for the I/O connection.

It is inherent that the semiconductor element (5) and the electrode are joined to the first surface of the metal block (330) through a jointing material.

Regarding claim 4, Arai et al. inherently teach the metal block (330) includes a surface having a region larger than that of the jointing material, which is in contact with the metal block.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,291,065 to Arai et al.

Regarding claim 2, Arai et al. differ from the claimed invention by not showing the metal layers formed on the both surfaces of the ceramic substrate are the same with each other in thickness. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the metal layers formed on the both surfaces of the ceramic substrate are the same with each other in thickness because it depends on the amount of heat that dissipated by the integrated circuit.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

7. Claim 5 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

8. Claims 6-10 are allowed.

9. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The most closely related art, US Patent No. 5,291,065 to Arai et al. Arai et al. do not anticipate or render the claimed invention such as a resin insulating layer having a third surface and a fourth surface opposite to the third surface, the third surface being joined to the second surface of the metal block; and a resin package for sealing the metal block and the semiconductor element, wherein the fourth surface of the resin insulating layer is exposed, and the resin insulating layer has an elasticity higher than that of the resin package.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 04/02/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

It is argued, in page 4 of the remarks, that Arai et al. do not teach or suggest a ceramic substrate joined to the second surface of the metal block and having metal layers formed on both surfaces. This argument is not convincing because Arai et al. teach a ceramic substrate (301) joined to the second surface of the metal block (330) and having metal layers (312, 340) formed on both surfaces (figure 10). Arai et al. further disclose there is no other ceramic substrate interposed between the metal block and the ceramic substrate.

It is argued, in page 4 of the remarks, that Arai et al. do not teach or suggest the semiconductor device as recited in claim 1. This argument is not convincing because Arai et al. teach all the claimed limitation as claimed in claim 1.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2811

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quang D Vu whose telephone number is 703-305-3826. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Thomas can be reached on 703-308-2772. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

qv  
June 2, 2003

